

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1, 3-8, 14-19, 36-37, 59, 61-64, and 70-75 are active in the application, with claims 1 and 59 being the independent claims.

The claims from Restriction Requirement Groups III (claims 20-35 and 38-54) and IV (claims 55-58 and 76-78) have been canceled.

The claims from Restriction Requirement Group II, (claims 9-12 and 65-68) are withdrawn. Claims 1, 3-6, 16, 36-37, 59-61, 72 and 75 are linking claims for Groups I and II.

Claim 79 has been canceled.

Applicants reserve the right to file one or more continuation or divisional applications directed to the canceled subject matter.

Based on the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejection Under 35 USC § 132

In the 9/8/04 office action at page 2, the Examiner objected to the specification under 35 U.S.C. § 132 alleging the introduction of new matter. Applicants respectfully traverse this objection.

Without agreeing to the Examiner's concerns or statements regarding new matter, and solely in the interests of advancing prosecution, Applicants have amended specification paragraph [0065] to return its language to that as found in the application as filed.

Similarly, without agreeing to the Examiner's concerns or statements regarding new matter, and solely in the interests of advancing prosecution, Applicants have canceled claim 79.

Accordingly the rejection for new matter can be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 1-4, 7, 8, 13, 16-18, 37, 59-61, 63, 64, 69 and 72-74 Under 35 USC § 102.

At page 5 of the 9/8/04 office action, the Examiner maintained the rejection of claims 1-4, 7, 8, 13, 16-18, 37, 59-61, 63, 64, 69 and 72-74 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Harris-White *et al*, *The Journal of Neurosci.* 18: 10366-10374 (1998) (hereinafter "Harris-White.") Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 60 was not pending.

Additionally, Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 59 to refer to integrin antagonists and also to exclude TGF β . Therefore, this rejection is overcome and may be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 36 and 59-62 Under 35 USC § 103(a).

In the 9/8/04 office action at page 6, the Examiner maintained the rejection of claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 36 and 59-62 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over

Matter *et al.*, *J. Cell Biology* 141:1019-1030 (1998) (hereinafter "Matter") in view of Harris-White. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants note that claim 2 and 60 were not pending.

Additionally, Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 59 to refer to integrin antagonists and also to exclude TGF β . Matter does not cure the deficiencies of Harris-White. Accordingly, *prima facie* obviousness is not established and this rejection may be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 1, 13-15, 59 and 69-71 Under 35 USC § 103(a).

At page 8 of the 9/8/04 office action, the Examiner maintained the rejection of claims 1, 13-15, 59 and 69-71 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matter in view of Harris-White. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 59 to refer to integrin antagonists and also to exclude TGF β . Matter does not cure the deficiencies of Harris-White. Accordingly, *prima facie* obviousness is not established and this rejection may be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 1, 19, 59 and 75 Under 35 USC § 103(a)

In the 9/8/04 office action at page 9, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 19, 59 and 75 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haß (Hass) *et al.*, *J. Biol. Chem.* 273:13892-13897 (1998) (hereinafter "Hass") in view of Harris-White. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Additionally, Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 59 to refer to integrin antagonists and also to exclude TGF β . Hass does not cure the deficiencies of Harris-White. Accordingly, *prima facie* obviousness is not established and this rejection may be withdrawn.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Michele A. Cimbala
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 33,851

Date: June 8, 2005

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600
406622.1